

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20, and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the specification and the accompanying drawings. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 7,069,439 to Chen (“Chen”) in view of United States Patent Publication Number 2004/0147251 to Nakayama et al. (“Nakayama”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office Action relies on portions of Chen describing the ability of a remote user to verify the integrity of a trusted platform comprising a trusted device using a challenge/response process. As correctly noted in the Office Action, Chen fails to teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims. When addressing the admitted deficiencies of Chen, the Office Action relies on portions of Nakayama disclosing an application verifier that verifies a downloaded application and instructs an application starter to execute the application if successfully verified.

While Applicant disagrees with the § 103(a) rejection, independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20 have been amended in order to advance prosecution. Applicant submits Chen and Nakayama clearly fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited by amended independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20. For example, neither Chen nor Nakayama teaches or suggests dynamically generating a first set of integrity information for a first processing system during boot operations for the first processing system by selecting an application needed by the first processing system during boot operations from a plurality of applications to be executed by the first processing system and generating the first set of integrity information for the application using a cryptographic algorithm. Chen and Nakayama also fail to teach or suggest sending the first set of integrity information to a

second processing system that has completed trusted boot operations to verify integrity of the application prior to execution of the application by the first processing system.

In view of the above, even if Chen and Nakayama could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would not teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 20. Further, Applicant submits that there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to modify Chen and/or Nakayama to include all the features of amended independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20. Consequently, Chen and Nakayama, whether taken alone or in combination with each other, are insufficient to render amended independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20 obvious under § 103(a).

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20 are allowable and dependent claims 3-6, 8, 11-14, 17-19, and 22 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims, as well as on their own merits.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20, and 22 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the rejection set forth in the Office Action with respect to any of the features of the independent claims and dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent claims or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9344 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the credit card in the previously filed credit card authorization form.

Appl. No. 10/816,267
Response Dated October 23, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 23, 2008

Docket No.: 1020.P18413
Examiner: Pan, Joseph T.
TC/A.U. 2135

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/Robert V. Racunas/

Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: October 23, 2008

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O Intellevate
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(724) 933-5529